

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-13 and 15-20 are pending in this application. Reconsideration and allowance of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 – TANABE

Claims 1, 2, 5, 11, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tanabe, JP 08037276 A. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants submit that Tanabe fails to disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, “a leadframe body having leads, wherein the leadframe body is of a lead-on-chip (LOC) type,” as recited in claims 1 and 11.

The Examiner admits, on page 4 in the Office Action, that the leadframe of Tanabe is not a LOC type. However, the Examiner allegedly asserts that Tanabe’s leadframe is “capable of being used in a LOC type environment.” Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner’s assertion is not a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as every feature recited in the claims must be shown to provide an anticipatory rejection.

The Examiner’s assertion that Tanabe’s leadframe is *capable of* being used in a LOC type environment is not found persuasive because the leadframe body being of a lead-on-chip (LOC) type is positively recited in claims 1 and 11 which set forth definite boundaries on the patent protection sought, and therefore must be evaluated and fully considered.

Further, all words in a claim must be considered in judging patentability of a claim against the prior art, In re Wilson, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970).

Because Tanabe fails to disclose each and every features of the claimed invention, it cannot provide a basis for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 – CHAN

Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Chan et al. (hereinafter “Chan”), U.S. Patent No. 6,236,107. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants submit that Chan fails to disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, “the tape ending at an end of each of the plurality of leads,” as recited in claim 11.

Instead, Chan discloses the plurality of leads ending ‘within’ the adhesive tape 20 (Fig. 3), rather than the tape ending at the end (or edge) of the plurality of leads.

In the Office Action, on page 3, the Examiner allegedly asserts that Figure 3 of Chan discloses the tape ending at each end of the leads. However, the Applicants contend that a careful examination of Chan’s Figure 3 makes it apparent that the leads do not end at the end of the tape.

Because Chan fails to disclose each and every features of the claimed invention, it cannot provide a basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanabe in view of Chan. This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claim 4 is allowable by virtue of their dependency on allowable independent claim 1 for at least the reasons set forth above. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of each of claims 1, 2, 4-13 and 15-20 in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and/or 1.17, particularly including extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By

John A. Castellano, Reg. No. 35,094
P.O. Box 8910

Reston, Virginia 20195

(703) 668-8000

JAC/DJC
JB